

Questions & Answers
Marathon Oil Co Bulk Plant
Chestnut & 3rd St
54448-9718-24
02-37-000330

If this release is the result of a spill, is it certain that PECFA will reimburse the SI/Remediation costs?

There are PECFA ineligible costs on site due to several spills during the filling of tanker trucks. Please include only PECFA eligible costs in your bid.

What is the PECFA cap on this site and how much money has been spent during the SI/RAP?

The site investigation cap is \$63,777.38. No claim has been submitted.

The City of Marathon has approved the removal and replacement of the sidewalk. Does this mean that the City of Marathon is also paying for the removal and replacement? If the City of Marathon is not paying for the removal and replacement of the sidewalk will the PECFA program pay as a third party damage and should the costs be included in the bid?

All ineligible costs will be the responsibility of the RP, only **eligible** costs should be included in the bid. The removal of the sidewalk will not be treated as a third party claim unless it is determined that the sidewalk is owned by the City of Marathon. However, the winning consultant should coordinate the removal and replacement of the sidewalk to coincide with remedial activities.

Has the release from the trucks been closed or will Commerce treat this as a commingled plume? If so, is the winning bidder responsible for identifying how cost will be separated between the PECFA eligible and non-PECFA eligible releases?

The spills (releases) will be treated as a commingled plume and eligible and non-eligible costs will have to be separated, therefore, only submit PECFA **eligible** costs in your Bid Response.

Will the consultant be allowed to file a PECFA claim for the work done to date, or will the winning bidder be responsible for filing a PECFA claim that may include work done by the previous consultant?

The Site Investigation (SI) claim is considered SI costs. The claimant will decide who submits the SI claim.

The current consultant indicated that they were waiting for the abandonment of the facility to conduct a remedial excavation. Is Commerce willing to wait until the abandonment occurs and what will the timeframe be?

No timeframe has been established. The selected consultant should coordinate the remedial action with the removal of the tanks, piping and pump house.

Lisa Gutknecht (DNR) requests in her April 12, 1999 letter, in Appendix C of the RAP, that the utility corridors and outfalls near the river be evaluated for plume movement. Was this done? If so, what were the results?

According to REI's RAP dated July 18, 2000, after the two spills on August 16, 1999, REI inspected the utility corridors and the Rib River outfall for signs of petroleum contamination. No signs of petroleum contamination were observed. Also, in RAP dated July 18, 2000, REI responded to the DNR's concerns by installing another monitoring well and two piezometers. See REI RAP dated July 18, 2000.

On page 549 of the RAP, mention is made that the bulk facility including all tanks, piping, and pump house will be removed. Has this been completed? If not, when is it scheduled for completion?

No timeframe has been established. The selected consultant should coordinate the remedial action with the removal of the tanks, piping and pump house.

Is the project managed by the DNR or by COMM?

The project is under the jurisdiction and is being managed by Commerce. Please refer to Section 1 of the bid document for the project manager's name, phone number and e-mail address.

Is a map available that shows where the 70 cubic yards of soil were excavated in 1999?

No map is available. However, the excavated soils were in the area of the pump house. See REI SI dated March 19, 1999 and REI RAP dated July 18, 2000 for a description of the removed contamination.

What are the conditions of the caps for the 11 monitoring wells and three piezometers? Do any of them need repair?

Unknown.